DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 365 PS 023 242

AUTHOR Silbereisen, Rainer K.; And Others
TITLE Childhood Adversities and Delinquency in Early Adolescence: Analyses of Samples from the Former Germanies.
PUB DATE Mar 95
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (61st, Indianapolis, IN, March 30-April 2, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; *Delinquency; *Family Environment; Foreign Countries; Individual Development; *Life Events; Parent Child Relationship; Personality; *Preadolescents; *Predictor Variables; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS Puberty

ABSTRACT

Risk factors for early adolescents' (700 between the ages of 10 to 13) delinquency were compared between groups of children high and low in childhood adversities. The samples represented young people from the two former Germanies (200 from former East and 500 from West Germany) who were interviewed in person. Additional information was gathered from parents who responded to questionnaires. The high adversity group had experienced two or more adversities such as parental divorce or family relocations, before the age of 9; the low adversity group had experiences fewer than two. In addition to age, gender, location of residence, and pubertal level, more proximal risk factors were assessed, namely, difficult temperament, low self-efficacy beliefs, lack of parental monitoring, and low acceptance by parents. Results showed that for males, more advanced pubertal maturation, low self-efficacy and few opportunities for monitoring corresponded to higher levels of delinquency. In comparing the adversity groups, this pattern was more pronounced and applied to both genders in the high adversity group. Furthermore, among the high adversity group, adolescents' chronological age, not maturational level, predicted delinquency. The differences between the adversity groups were interpreted in reference to the developmental taxonomy of delinquency as suggested by Moffitt (1993). (Author/HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 382 365

Childhood Adversities and Delinquency in Early Adolescence: Analyses of Samples from the Former Germanies

Rainer K. Silbereisen

Burkhard Rinker

Beate Schwarz

University of Jena, Germany

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R.K. Silbereisen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, March 30-April 2, 1995 (Symposium „International Perspectives on Antisocial Behavior in Youth," Elizabeth Susman, Chair).

PS 023242

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Risk factors for early adolescents' (ages 10 to 13) delinquency were compared between groups high and low in childhood adversities. The samples represented young people from the two former Germanies. The high (low) adversity group had experienced two or more (less than two) adversities, such as parental divorce or family relocation, before the age of nine. In addition to age, gender, location of residence, and pubertal level, more proximal risk factors were assessed, namely, difficult temperament, low self-efficacy beliefs, lack of parental monitoring, and low acceptance by parents. Particularly for males, more advanced pubertal maturation, low self-efficacy and few opportunities for monitoring corresponded to higher levels of delinquency. In comparing the adversity groups, this pattern was more pronounced and applied to both genders in the high adversity group. Furthermore, among the latter, adolescents' chronological age, not maturational level, predicted delinquency. The differences between the adversity groups are interpreted in reference to the developmental taxonomy of delinquency as suggested by Moffitt (1993).

Childhood Adversities and Delinquency in Early Adolescence: Analyses of Samples from the Former Germanies

German unification represents a unique social experiment. For developmentalists, the ongoing changes in institutions devoted to the education and development of the young generation represent extraordinary opportunities for comparative studies on the conditions of becoming adolescent.

Comparing samples from former East and West Germany, in recent work my colleagues and I have been studying differences and commonalities in the role of early adversities for adolescent adjustment. Results showed that a high load of adversities, such as parental divorce , serious illness or relocation corresponded to earlier timing of psychosocial transitions (Silbereisen et al., 1994). Moreover, the experience of such adversities during childhood was related to lower monitoring and more contacts with problem-prone peers in adolescence (Silbereisen, Schwarz & Rinker, in press). In yet further studies, we have been analyzing the role of particular adversities, such as family relocation, on specific behaviors, such as the timing of first vocational choices (Silbereisen, Vondracek & Berg, submitted).

Based on these aforementioned studies, we wanted to gain more insight into the differences between adolescents who were raised in normal as compared to adversity-stricken families. More specifically, the aim was to illuminate the relationship between childhood adversities and delinquency in early

adolescence. In contrast to our earlier studies, we were interested in family experiences and personality attributes linking adversities with adolescents' behaviors.

Following the distinction between more proximal and distal antecedents, measures on these two broad classes of influences were selected for this study. Concerning proximal influences, lack of parental monitoring is known to be a precursor of delinquent behavior, the reason being that the unsupervised young submit to the pressures for delinquency exerted by peer groups (Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984). Whereas monitoring is seen as protective against delinquency, parental support is conceived as promoting competency and thereby indirectly diminishing risks for delinquency. Consequently, the latter aspect of parental behavior was also included.

The distal influences on delinquency in adolescence were represented by the sociodemographic variables of age, gender, and location of residence, in either former East or West Germany. In line with previous studies, we predicted higher delinquency levels with increasing chronological age. Furthermore, males were expected to report higher levels of delinquency (Patterson, DeBaryshe & Ramsey, 1989). With regard to the East/West distinction, a few years ago we would have predicted lower levels of delinquency in the East. However, five years after unification figures are likely to have converged (Kreuzer et al., ...).

Chronological age is a rough index of differences in the level of psychosocial development. However, particularly in early adolescence, physical maturation is likely to indicate

differences in adolescents' social outreach better than age. Based on this assumption, we expected higher delinquency scores with more advanced levels of physical maturation (Stattin & Magnusson, 1990).

Individual differences in personality come into play between proximal and distal influences. Apparently, they have no strong direct impact on delinquency itself, but nevertheless are of interest as they influence the way in which individuals negotiate with their environment. Based on earlier research, we chose temperament and self-efficacy as domains for this area of study. According to Thomas and Chess (1977), children with a difficult temperament (e.g., low flexibility vis-à-vis environmental changes) are more likely to experience negative interactions with significant others, which, in turn, result in an increased risk of adjustment problems. In line with this view, Windle (1992) found for mid-adolescence a positive correlation between a difficult temperament profile and the frequency of delinquent behavior reported for the past six months. Moreover, he reported evidence for both direct and indirect effects of difficult temperament on delinquency. Consequently, we expected delinquency levels to covary with the difficulty of temperament.

Self-efficacy involves a generative capability to organize and execute courses of action to attain specific results. Adolescents' beliefs in this regard encompass judgments about this capability to accomplish a certain level of performance, and as such ist assessment needs to be domain-specific. The transitions during adolescence represent particular challenges

because the young need to acquire a multitude of new skills. The confidence in one's own capabilities, accumulated from childhood onwards, influences the ease with which challenges, such as the demands in school, are mastered.

Adolescents exhibiting low, school-related, self-efficacy beliefs are likely to fail in school. Not succeeding in this major domain of adolescent functioning is a precursor of delinquency and consequently we predicted higher levels of delinquency for lower self-efficacy beliefs (Patterson et al., 1989). Furthermore, the repeated experience of lacking efficacy in the normative domain of school is known to drive adolescents to other opportunities of success, with deviant peer groups representing one of the possibilities (Kaplan et al., 1986).

Until now we did not consider potential differences in the patterns of risk factors as a function of the level of childhood adversities. Differences in the circumstances of upbringing in this regard open up, or shut down, opportunities for individuals' negotiations with contexts. In such a situation, Bronfenbrenner and Crouter (1983) would assume differential pathways to similar developmental outcomes. An instructive example is Baldwin et al.'s (1993) research on the differential role of restrictive parenting. In a disadvantaged, risk-loaded environment more supervision and even restriction by parents were an advantage for the development of cognitive competence. As one would have predicted, under more positive circumstances such parenting was rather damaging.

Seen against this backdrop, we wanted to explore whether the parenting variables, personality attributes, and socio-

demographic variables differed in importance across the levels of adversities studied. This was encouraged by an earlier finding that East/West differences, such as the timing of first romantic relationships, turned up only when comparing within the adversity group.

Concerning personality attributes, we found it plausible to assume that individual differences in temperamental difficulties and self-efficacy beliefs would be more relevant among the adverse group compared to the majority of adolescents. Under normative circumstances, we would argue, negative temperamental styles may be balanced by the positive impact of a well-functioning family setting. In an adversity-stricken environment, however, such a balance may be at jeopardy. As shown by Elder (Elder, Caspi & Van Nguyen, 1986), fathers' irritability made the difference between families who were not able to cope satisfactorily with economic hardship and those who were able to adjust.

The same argument can be used in regard to parenting behaviors such as monitoring. Within healthy environments, a lack of monitoring may be compensated by other positive influences. In at-risk circumstances, however, adolescents' resilience may be exhausted and thus similarly low levels of monitoring may result in negative outcomes.

Depending on whether the adversity groups differ in the level of delinquency, differential patterns of risk factors would lead to different conclusions. Based on the general view that adversity-experienced adolescents are at higher risk of

delinquency, we expected higher delinquency among the adversely affected group of adolescents.

Method

Sample

In 1993, 700 adolescents between the ages of 10 and 13 were interviewed in person. Additional information was gathered from the parents who responded to questionnaires. Although not a random sample, the sample was drawn to represent young males and females from former East (200) and West Germany (500). The sample was stratified by gender, type of secondary school, and age group. Adolescents from the East were oversampled.

Measures

The field interviews were conducted by the trained research staff of a commercial survey institute. All assessment materials had been developed by the present authors.

Adversities. The parents (mothers in most cases) gave information on whether the adolescents had experienced any of the following events before the age of nine: parental unemployment, substitute labor, or occupational re-training severe illness of a parent, divorce or death of a parent, relocation of the family, less than 9 years of schooling of the father. Adolescents who reportedly had experienced two or more such events (the upper 12% of the cumulated distribution) comprised the high adversity group. All other adoelscents belonged to the low adversity group.

Maturational status. Reminiscent of Petersen et al.'s (1988) scale for the assessment of pubertal development, female adolescents were asked for information on breast development,

pubic hair growth, and menarche. Male adolescents reported on the development of pubic hair and body growth only. No development of a given aspect was indicated by 1, completed development by 4, and intermediate steps by scores of 2 and 3, respectively. The mean scores were used in the analyses.

Parental behaviors. Based on various measures of parental support, adolescent participants responded to a large number of items describing the quality of parental behaviors. The target person was the mother. Only in a few cases of missing data, reports on fathers' behaviors were used. Exploratory factor analyses resulted in a scale comprising seven items which basically assessed (a) maternal challenges for development (e.g., My mother asks me regularly how I did in school) and (b) the emotional quality of parent-child interaction (e.g., My parents only need to watch me to find out whether something is wrong). Participants rated the items on 4-point scales (1 = does not apply, 4 = applies fully). The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was .74. In addition, the degree to which children informed their mothers about their own thoughts and activities was assessed using two items (e.g., Do you tell your mother where you spend your time after school?). The 4-point rating scale was anchored by 1 = never and 4 = always. The correlation between the two items was $r = .49$.

Temperament. For the assessment of individual differences in temperament, we utilized the following five attributions as measured in the DOTS-R (Windle & Lerner, 1986): general activity level (6 items; e.g., I can't stay still for long), approach-withdrawal (4 items; e.g., On meeting a new person, I

tend to move towards him or her), flexibility-rigidity (4 items; e.g., It takes me a long time to get used to a new thing in the home), rhythmicity of eating (4 items; e.g., I usually eat the same amount each day), and distractibility (4 items; e.g., Once I am involved in a task, nothing can distract me from it). The adolescents responded to each item on a 4-point scale (1 = does not apply, 4 = applies fully). Most of the internal consistencies were between .62 and .83, similar in size to that reported by Windle and Lerner (1986). The exception was flexibility-rigidity with a coefficient of .52. Adding all temperament aspects in which adolescents scored below the 30th percentile (or above the 70th, depending on the direction of the scale), an overall index of difficult temperament was formed following the procedure as chosen by Windle (1992).

Self-efficacy. It is well-known that measures of self-efficacy should be domain-specific (Skinner, 1990). Based on an instrument developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1986), we gathered data on school-related self-efficacy. Using 4-point rating scales (1 = does not apply, 4 = applies fully), adolescents rated ten items describing adolescents' perception of contingencies between their efforts and success in school (e.g., If I work hard I achieve satisfactory results). The internal consistency of the scale was .86.

Delinquency. Separately for their life-time and for the last year, adolescents reported on whether they had committed any of a number of delinquent acts (1 = yes). The items, drawn from Loesel (1975), covered three aspects of delinquency:

aggression (4 items; e.g., Did you hurt a person in a fight?), property (6 items; e.g., Did you commit shoplifting in a store or mall?), conduct (2 items, e.g., Did you cut class for a whole school day?). In addition to the sum scores representing each of these aspects, a total delinquency index was formed.

Results

The results are presented in two steps. After comparing the adversity groups in all variables under study, the outcomes of regression analyses on the main hypotheses are reported.

Mean Differences

In preliminary analyses, we compared the adversity groups with regard to delinquency and the risk factors. The ANOVAs were conducted with adversities (high, low) and gender as factors. None of the interactions was significant. The means for all variables are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

In contrast to expectation, the adversity groups did not differ significantly in any of the delinquency measures. It should be added, however, that the annual frequency figures were higher, albeit not significantly, among adolescents of the high adversity group. Concerning delinquency, gender was significant ($p < .001$) for total delinquency, aggression, and property offenses in both the lifetime and annual time frames. Females' delinquency scores were lower than males' scores.

The distal and proximal risk factors showed a number of significant differences. The only gender difference concerned

females' higher scores in pubertal maturation ($F = 5.16$, $p < .05$). Three effects of adversities were observed. Adolescents with cumulated childhood adversities scored higher on the difficult temperament measure ($F = 5.57$, $p < .05$), and they kept their mothers less well informed about their own activities. Parental support and self-efficacy, however, did not differ across adversity groups. Maturational status also showed a tendency ($F = 3.57$, $p < .10$) for higher levels in the high adversity group.

The lack of a mean difference in delinquency between adolescents high and low in adversity is important to bear in mind for the following regression analyses. Where we would find differences in the predictive pattern of risk factors, this could not be attributed to differences in the severity of delinquency.

Risk Factors for Delinquency

We were interested in the effects of the more proximal risk factors, net of the role of socio-demographic variables and maturational status. Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted separately for lifetime and annual delinquency. The sociodemographic variables were included first, followed by maturational status. In the final step, personality variables and characteristics of parent-child interaction were included. It should be noted that the results were essentially the same when analyzed in the reverse order. Furthermore, only the relative role of age and maturational status changed somewhat across the steps.

Low adversity group. The results on lifetime delinquency are summarized in Table 2. The regression coefficients, p-values, and the explained variance for the final step of the hierarchical analyses are shown. In addition to the results on total delinquency, information is given on the three aspects of delinquency. All tables that follow are organized in the same way.

Table 2

Concerning total delinquency, gender and maturational status (net of age) were significant predictors, as expected. Males and more mature adolescents reported higher lifetime delinquency. The political region did not play a role. Among the proximal variables, as predicted, low self-efficacy beliefs and low monitoring corresponded to a higher delinquency load. The explained variance was 39%. This pattern of results is similar to the data on property offenses and, although less pronounced, to that on aggression.

Conduct problems, such as staying out of school without permission, were linked to school-related efficacy. Those low in self-efficacy had higher scores on this aspect of delinquency. Furthermore, adolescents from former East Germany scored lower in misconduct.

The results on the annual delinquency measures were generally similar to the lifetime data. This is not surprising given the young age of the participants.

Table 3

High adversity group. The results on lifetime delinquency among the adversity group are shown in Table 4. The regression coefficients were higher on average and consequently, the explained variance was also higher.

Table 4

Beginning with the total delinquency, we see a pattern highly similar to the low adversity group concerning self efficacy and monitoring. In contrast to the earlier results, however, adversity-stricken adolescents from the East revealed significantly lower delinquency scores than their age mates from the West. Another difference to the earlier results concerns the relative importance of age and maturational status. Whereas the latter was relevant among the low adversity adolescents, it was chronological age that was relevant here. In other words, expect as was predicted maturational status was shown to play no role above and beyond the fact that older adolescents had higher delinquency scores. Additional analyses in the reversed order of inclusion made clear that the results were not a function of multicollinearity.

Whereas property offenses showed practically the same pattern of predictors as total delinquency, aggression revealed higher scores for males and among adolescents with lower monitoring. None of the effects were significant concerning misconduct. The latter is in contrast to the low adversity

group where poor school-related efficacy was a predictor of delinquency.

The positive effect of parental acceptance on property offenses is surprising. As the sign of the respective correlation coefficients were negative in all analyses, this result indicates a suppression effect.

The results on annual delinquency in the high adversity group are shown in Table 5. Concerning the total delinquency, the pattern of results was again identical to the lifetime data, including the fact that chronological age, not maturational status, were relevant. In regard to the separate aspects of delinquency, there were also no major differences between the lifetime and the annual frame of reference.

Additional Analyses

Gender was a major predictor of individual differences in delinquency. In order to see whether the pattern of risk factors would also differ between males and females, the above analyses were rerun separately for these subgroups. Although the patterns were similar in the low adversity group, the size and significance were not. Whereas males showed much more pronounced effects, only few effects were significant at all among females. Thus, the results described in this paper for the low adversity group apply to male adolescents of that group in particular. One factorspecific to females was that higher levels of difficult temperament corresponded to more pronounced delinquency.

Concerning the high adversity group, however, male and female adolescents were highly similar in the pattern and size

of predictive relations with delinquency. In other words, both genders if raised under the influence of adversities showed patterns of risk factors that in the low adversity group were typical of males. Naturally, the sample sizes for these additional analyses were smaller, particularly for the high adversity group, and consequently the results need to be viewed with caution.

Discussion

In this study, we compared the level of delinquency in adolescents differing in psychosocial background. The high adversity group (about one tenth of the sample) was characterized by the experience of two or more adversities, such as divorce or relocation, before the age of nine. The low adversity group reported less than two such adversities. The sample of adolescents was stratified as to age, gender, school track, and location of residence in either former East or West Germany. The delinquency measures showed higher levels in males but no differences across political regions.

The main focus of the study was on whether the pattern of risk factors differed across the two levels of adversities. In addition to the sociodemographic variables, a number of proximal risk factors were studied: low self-efficacy and difficult temperament, low parental monitoring and low acceptance by parents. Concerning the low adversity group, predictions were confirmed in regard to self-efficacy and monitoring. More specifically, low eficacy beliefs related to success in school, and low opportunities for supervision by parents increased the risk for delinquency. Delinquency was

also higher in males and among adolescents from the West. In contrast to expectations, difficult temperament made no difference.

Among the high adversity group, a similar pattern applied. However, the regression coefficients and the percentages of explained variance were higher. In spite of these commonalties there were also some differences as presumed. First, whereas in the low adversity group pubertal status was important, above and beyond age, in the prediction of delinquency, in the high adversity group, the reverse was true. Second, school-related efficacy beliefs were not relevant among the adversity-stricken group.

In additional analyses on both adversity groups, some gender differences were found. In a nutshell, the pattern of risk factors described above for the low adversity group was more representative for males than for females. Furthermore, difficult temperament played a role for female adolescents only.

Before we discuss these results, a number of caveats need to be mentioned. The data are correlational in nature, and consequently it is not possible to guarantee that the risk factors studied are indeed causal antecedents to delinquency. It should also be noted that we were not able to study a more comprehensive set of variables known to be related to delinquency (Patterson, DeBaryshe & Loeber, 1989). Thus, the pattern of results we found could be influenced by the omission of important risk factors. Furthermore, the adolescents gave information on both the risk factors (excepting the

aadversities) and the delinquency measures. This could result in an exaggeration of the true relations between the two sets of variables. Finally, the data on childhood adversities represent recollections. Although the simple facts we asked were presumably not misrepresented, caution is in order (Brewin, Andrews & Gotlieb, 1993).

The adversity group did not differ in the level of delinquency from the majority of adolescents. In spite of this result, we found some important differences in the patterns of risk factors for delinquency. In the following we concentrate on the latter. In the prediction of delinquency in the adversity group, it was not maturational level, an individualized personal attribute, but chronological age, a status attribute, which was relevant. An interesting but highly speculative interpretation would start by relating the delinquency among the majority of adolescents low in adversity to changes related to puberty, whereas these processes would not be seen as related to delinquency among the high adversity group. In the latter case, due to the role of normative controls that diminish with age, differences in chronological age rather than in pubertal maturation would represent risk factors.

Before we proceed, reference should be made to the work of Moffitt (1993) that stimulated our view. In distinguishing between adolescence-limited and life course-persistent delinquency, she claimed that one would not be able to distinguish members of these two groups on the level of delinquency. Rather, the actual differences are to be seen in

the developmental trajectories leading to delinquency. Whereas adolescence-limited delinquency is rooted in rather uniform reactions of most adolescents to the usual mismatch between their wishes for autonomy and the usual constraints set by adults, life course-persistent delinquency builds on cumulated problems of adjustment which date back to childhood. Certainly our high adversity group should not be simply identified with the high risk adolescents Moffitt had described; nevertheless, her distinction reminded us of our results on chronological age versus pubertal maturation as predictors of delinquency.

Are there other differences between the groups that could be interpreted against the backdrop of the presumed distinction between the two developmental pathways to delinquency? In our view, the fact that school-related efficacy beliefs played a differential role is a case in point. Among the low adversity group, low efficacy was related to higher levels in all aspects of delinquency. In the high adversity group, however, aggression and misconduct were not associated with efficacy. According to Eccles (1993), early adolescence is a time that confronts many adolescents with a mismatch between their growing autonomy and the demands of the secondary school, which, particularly during the transition from elementary to high school, are more rigid than many adolescents are able to cope with easily. In this vein, low efficacy beliefs in regard to one's school achievement could indeed open up opportunities for delinquent peer groups and role models. For adolescents revealing the other type of delinquency, however, Moffitt (1993) would argue that such negative experiences with school

would not make much of a difference vis-à-vis the many other risks for delinquency which these adolescents have accumulated during childhood.

Although we must admit that we have no independent evidence on early differences in developmental pathways beyond parents' reports on childhood adversities, we find the notion that our data reflect this distinction worth considering. Certainly, on the present data base this is speculation and needs corroboration by further analyses.

The results on difficult temperament were disappointing. In neither adversity group did this personality aspect make a difference. Bearing in mind Elder's (Elder, Caspi & Van Nguyen, 1986) finding that an explosive temperament in combination with strained family relations made things worse in economically depressed families, we asked ourselves whether difficult temperament might be more important in interaction with the other variables. However, additional analyses within adversity groups, run separately for subgroups high versus low in the temperament measure, did not show any differential patterns that could be interpreted in the sense mentioned above.

As Windle (1992) found a clear relation between difficult temperament and delinquency, the question remains as to why the temperament dimension was of so little importance. However, their sample was older (mean age 15.5 years), and their temperament index was built on a considerably larger set of aspects (although the subset chosen by us comprised aspects assumed to be particularly relevant for delinquency). Thus, it may well be that temperamental differences would have played

the predicted role at a later stage in adolescence and/or with the assessment of a more differentiated index of temperament.

Finally, in comparison to other studies we also need to admit that the delinquency measure may itself have not been differentiated enough. Rather than assessing the frequency of delinquent behaviors and averaging across offenses, we simply added whether adolescents had committed a number of such behaviors within a period of time. This restriction in the measurement was rooted in the fact that the prevalence of the offenses studied was rather low anyway.

References

Baldwin,A. L., Baldwin, C. P., Kasser, T., Zax, M., Sameroff, A. & Seifer, R. (1993). Contextual risk and resiliency during late adolescence. Development and Psychopathology, 5, 741-761.

Bronfenbrenner, U. & Crouter, A. C. (1983). The evolution of enviromental models in developmental research. In W. Kessen (Ed.), History, theory, and methodes, (pp. 357-414), Volume 1 of P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology (4th ed.), New York: Wiley.

Brewin, A. F., Andrews, W. M. & Gotlieb, I. H. (1993). Psychopathology and early experience: A reappraisal of retrospective reports. Psychological Bulletin, 113, 82-98.

Eccles, J. S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Buchanan, C. M., Reuman, D., Flanagan, C., & Mac Iver, D. (1993). The impact of stage-environment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and families. American Psychologist, 48, 90-101.

Elder, G. H., Jr., Caspi, A. & Van Nguyen (1986). Resourceful and vulnerable children: Family influences in hard times. In R. K. Silbereisen, K. Eyferth & G. Rudinger (eds.), Development as action in context: Problem behavior and normal youth development (pp. 167-186). Berlin: Springer.

Jerusalem, M. & Schwarzer, R. (1986). Selbstwirksamkeit. In R. Schwarzer (ed), Skalen zur Befindlichkeit und Persönlichkeit. Unpublished Report. Berlin: Freie Universitaet.

Kaplan, H. B., Martin, S. S., Johnson, R. J. & Robbins, C. (1986). Escalation of marijuana use: Application of a general theory of deviant behavior. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 27, 44-61.

Kreuzer, A., Goergen, T., Muench, V. & Schneider, H. (...). Das Dunkelfeld im Systemvergleich. Erste Ergebnisse des Projektes „Vergleichende Aspekte der Dunkelfeldforschung - eine Replikation der Giessener Delinquenzbefragung in der ehemaligen DDR und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Giessen.

Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. Psychological Review, 100, 674-701.

Patterson, G. R., DeBaryshe, B. D. and Ramsey, E. A. (1989). Developmental Perspective on Antisocial Behavior. American Psychologist, 44, 329-335.

Petersen, A. C. & Crockett, L. (1985). Pubertal timing and grade effects on adjustment. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14, 191-206.

Silbereisen, R. K., Schwarz, B. & Rinker, B. (in press). The timing of psychosocial transitions in adolscence: Commonalities and differences in unified Germany. In J. Youniss Ed.), East-West families and youth, (New Directions in Child Development). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Silbereisen, R. K., Schwarz, B., Rinker, B. & von Eye, A. (1995). Der Einfluss familiaerer Belastungen in der Kindheit auf den Zeitpunkt jugendtypischer Uebergaenge

(pp. 204-224). In B. Nauck, N. Schneider & A. Toelke (Eds.), Familie und Lebensverlauf im gesellschaftlichen Umbruch. Stuttgart: Enke Verlag.

Silbereisen, R. K., Vondracek, F. W. & Berg, L. A. (submitted). Differential timing of initial vocational choice: The influence of early childhood family relocation and parental support behaviors in two cultures.

Skinner, E. A. (1990). What causes success and failure in school and friendship? Developmental differentiation of children's beliefs across middle childhood. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 13, 157-176.

Stattin, H. & Magnusson, D. (1990). Pubertal maturation in female development. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Thomas, A., & Chess, S. (1977). Temperament and development. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Windle, M. (1992). Temperament and social support in adolescence: Interrelations with depressive symptoms and delinquent behaviors. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 21, 1-21.

Windle, M. & Lerner, R. M. (1986). Reassessing the dimensions of temperamental individuality across the life span: The revised dimensions of temperament survey (DOTS-R). Journal of Adolescent Research, 1, 213-230.

Table 1. Means for Group Low and High in Adversities

	Adversity			
	Low		High	
Variables	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total Delinquency				
Lifetime	1.60	.82	1.79	1.02
Annual	1.16	.64	1.50	.79
Aggression				
Lifetime	.38	.11	.45	.16
Annual	.24	.08	.34	.14
Conduct				
Lifetime	.24	.18	.26	.33
Annual	.19	.13	.24	.23
Property				
Lifetime	.98	.53	1.08	.53
Annual	.73	.42	.92	.42
Maturation	1.86	1.96	1.92	2.26
Difficult	1.28	1.34	1.68	1.56
Temperament				
Self-Efficacy	3.15	3.21	3.10	3.17
Acceptance	3.25	3.27	3.14	3.33
Monitoring	3.27	3.44	3.20	3.15

Tabelle 2. Predictors of Lifetime Deliquency in the Low Adversity Group

	Deliquency Aspect			
Predictor	Total	Aggression	Conduct	Property
Female	-.21***	-.24***	-.05	-.18***
Age	.08	.08	-.00	.08
East	-.07	.04	-.14***	-.07
Maturation	.16***	.05	.12*	.18***
Difficult Temperament	.05	.01	-.01	.08
Self-Efficacy	-.12**	-.10*	-.12**	-.08*
Acceptance (low)	.06	.09*	.03	.03
Monitoring (low)	.10*	.03	.02	.13***
R^2	.15	.11	.06	.15
	< .0001	< .0001	.0001	<.0001

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Tabelle 3. Predictors of Annual Deliquency in the Low Adversity Group

	Deliquency Aspect			
	Total	Aggression	Conduct	Property
Female	-.15***	-.19***	-.04	-.12***
Age	.05	.06	-.06	.07
East	-.11**	-.01	-.16***	-.09
Maturation	.16***	.03	.14*	.17***
Difficult Temperament	.06	.06	-.01	.07
Self-Efficacy	-.12***	-.11 **	-.14***	-.07
Acceptance (low)	.03	.04	.00	.03
Monitoring (low)	.12**	.07	.03	.13***
R^2	.13	.08	.06	.12
	< .0001	< .0001	< .0001	< .0001

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Tabelle 4. Predictors of Lifetime Deliquency in the High Adversity Group

	Deliquency Aspect			
	Total	Aggression	Conduct	Property
Female	-.24*	-.23*	.04	-.30**
Age	.36*	.20	.22	.39**
East	-.21*	-.05	-.17	-.24*
Maturation	-.03	.00	.04	-.07
Difficult Temperament	.10	.07	.10	.08
Self-Efficacy	-.23	.01	-.07	-.35**
Acceptance (low)	-.16	.10	-.10	-.28*
Monitoring (low)	.35***	.27*	.13	.38***
R^2	.32	.20	.12	.38
	.0009	.0558	.3953	.0001

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Tabelle 5. Predictors of Annual Deliquency in the High Adversity Group

	Deliquency Aspect			
	Total	Aggression	Conduct	Property
Female	-.22	-.17	-.03	-.26*
Age	.27	.20	.08	.33*
East	-.15	-.03	-.07	-.22*
Maturation	-.01	-.01	.18	-.11
Difficult Temperament	.10	.08	.05	.09
Self-Efficacy	-.16	-.02	-.04	-.26*
Acceptance (low)	.03	.16	-.02	-.03
Monitoring (low)	.28*	.22	.14	.29*
R^2	.27	.19	.08	.34
	.0062	.0756	.6614	.0004

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$